

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Approved For Release 2005/07/26 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000200130006-4

77 543
17 FEB 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Administration
FROM : F. W. M. Janney
Director of Personnel
SUBJECT : Review and Comments on the MAG Paper of
7 December 1976 on Agency Personnel
Management

We have reviewed the MAG paper on Agency personnel and career management and attach herewith our observations and comments as follows:

- TAB A - General Overview Comments
- TAB B - Specific Comments on Primary Points
- TAB C - Specific Comments on Secondary Points

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
F. W. M. Janney

Atts.

Distribution:

- Orig + 1 - Adse, w/atts
- 2 - D/Pers, w/atts
- 1 - OP/PEC, w/atts

OP/PEC/ [] 6 Feb 77)

25X1

Approved For Release 2005/07/26 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000200130006-4

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

GENERAL OVERVIEW COMMENTS

The MAG paper is based essentially on their review and critique of Office of Personnel papers submitted to the EAG in October 1976. These included a paper wherein OP shared its initial observations on the then recently received results of the Employee Attitudinal Survey. OP cautioned that our comments at that time did not represent the final product of a full study and analysis of the survey results.

MAG has in many instances construed OP's initial observations relative to the survey as final conclusions and in other areas the selectivity of their comments have distorted the full substance of OP's original presentations. Many of the points identified by the MAG as requiring improvement are well taken and have already been the subject of study including consideration by the EAG.

The paper, however, also includes a number of questionable and unsupportable generalized observations followed by corrective recommendations which we believe would be dysfunctional or counter-productive.

The most important impact of the MAG paper, which seriously impairs its potential value as a professionally objective document, is its generally cynical tone, a disposition toward the negative and concentration on weaknesses and allegations of failures in various elements of the total system. The tenor of the MAG paper also conveys the impression that managers responsible for implementing, monitoring or improving the effectiveness of the system in meeting the needs of the Agency and the individual employee are not seriously concerned nor motivated to disturb the status quo. This is simply not true. It must be recognized that extensive and major changes in the Agency's personnel and career management approach were instituted in 1974 and were essentially designed to update the static approaches of the 1950's to the 1970's. Although the Agency was under external "siege" in the interval from 1974 to the present, creditable effort and improvement in implementation by the Career Services of these new approaches (such as the PDP and the so-called PASG requirements) has been clearly demonstrated and must be acknowledged.

The situation of the Agency's current and future role, missions, authorities, and relationships with the Community, the new Administration and Congress are far from resolved. The input from both the recent Agency-wide Employee Attitudinal Survey and the Morale Survey certainly reflect the concern and unease of our employees as regards the future. In our view, major changes in Agency personnel and career management approaches at this time will not enhance employee morale nor be appropriate until we have a better feel for where we are heading as an Agency.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

We must, however, continue to correct the recognized weaknesses in the current system and, as appropriate, institute meaningful change. We (OP, the MAG, managers, supervisors and individual employees) must strive to cooperatively work together in today's situation with an affirmative emphasis and as optimistic an outlook as possible in using and improving the good elements of the system already in being.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON PRIMARY POINTS

CAREER DEVELOPMENT

MAG (para 2) - Employee concerns about adequacy of career development procedures.

MAG does not agree that the principal problem is one of unrealistic employee expectations or that further Employee Bulletins are a solution.

OP Comment: OP has not identified unrealistic employee expectations as the "principal" problem. The analysis of survey results has identified misconceptions and/or lack of understanding as to "how the system works" as one of the principal areas requiring early attention. The effort to address these issues should include timely issuances and re-issuances of Agency-wide and Directorate informational bulletins and re-emphasize that employees have a responsibility to avail themselves of information already published. Some 37% of survey respondents admitted that they had not read their Directorate's handbook on Personnel Management.

A Headquarters Notice on the attitudinal survey results has been published which acknowledges both the value of employee responses in identification of areas where corrective action is needed and those areas of concern being actively addressed by management.

MAG (para 3) - No need for new systems but use the ones we have.

MAG sees career planning as a joint endeavor with management.

MAG does not see the need for new systems but a need to use the systems we have (PDP and APP), observing that it is the "rare component" that consults the individual for whom it is planning, while MAG is not aware of follow-up action on "any of the plans."

OP Comment: Employee career development in the Agency inherently requires the collaboration, participation, understanding and collective action of the individual, the Career Service representative and the line supervisor. The PDP is essentially a Career Service program designed to be a "living" planning instrument from which actions are taken (i.e., assignments and training) to further develop individual employees toward specific goals.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

The PDP system is specifically designed to provide in reportorial form a document that can serve as the basis for evaluation of the achievement of planning goals for the individuals involved, by both the Head of Career Service and the DDCI himself.

Contrary to MAG's impression that "no follow-up action is taken on any of the plans," periodic monitoring of the Career Service confirms that the PDP is being used as intended. The extent of individual career counseling conducted by the Career Services and Subgroups varies between the services and undoubtedly can be improved and must be emphasized.

The APP is a planning document designed to provide Directorate management with an advance overview of their plan and goals for the prospective Fiscal Year. The APP system, like the PDP, includes a reportorial format for the review and evaluation of the manpower planning of each Directorate by the DDCI. "Feedback" of the Directorate APPs to subordinate managers needs improvement and has been emphasized in the FY 77 DDCI's guidance to the Deputy Directors. The theoretical value of the APP and its pertinence to managerial planning is evident but its preparation and analysis requires a sizable administrative effort. A number of senior managers (office Heads) do not see the APP as presently formatted as useful to their planning. Top management must address the utilization of the APP program at an early date and decide whether it should be retained, modified or dropped completely.

MAG (para 4) - Career planning needs to be addressed primarily at the level of the immediate supervisor.

Supervisors should discuss career development - both future assignments and possible training - with employees on a regular basis.

Fitness Reports on all employees with less than 15 years service should include explicit references to possible future jobs and possible training opportunities.

OP Comment: As previously stated, employee development involves responsibilities for the employee, the Career Service and the individual's immediate supervisor.

The line supervisor most certainly should discuss career development with the employee but these discussions should be in the context of the Career Service's planning and

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

evaluation of the individual rather than limited to the area of the supervisor's immediate purview. The primary focus of these supervisor and employee discussions must be on job performance matters, not on future assignments.

We are not in agreement with MAG's suggestion that Fitness Reports contain explicit references to future jobs. Other than commenting on jobs within their own supervisory jurisdiction - which may or may not be applicable to all of the qualifications or developmental prospects for the employee, the majority of Agency supervisors are not in a position to make such observations. The substitution of supervisory developmental planning for the multiple inputs provided by a Career Service board or panel would limit the identification of prospective future assignments for many employees where their total experiences and qualifications might be better utilized. The Office of Personnel is presently preparing to undertake an in-depth study of the Agency's individual performance evaluation (Fitness Report) and competitive evaluation and ranking system to determine what changes or additions are needed to meet the informational needs of employees, supervisors and the Career Service panels.

MAG (para 5) - Agency policy should be instituted to insure that each employee with two or three years service would discuss career development with the appropriate individual or group likely to make decisions relative to the employee's future. Most professional personnel should be reassigned after a two to three year first tour.

OP Comment: It has been Agency policy since 1973 that Career Services must institute and provide "high-profile" career counseling services for its members whereby employees are given the opportunity for walk-in counseling or for periodic discussions with Career Service representatives on their current status, future job prospects and training needs. As noted by OP previously, the extent of such counseling varies between Career Services and certainly requires emphasis as to its importance.

The length of an individual's initial tour cannot be arbitrarily restricted to a specified time period but must be established according to the nature of the assignment, the needs of the Agency, and the developmental needs of the employee.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

VERSATILITY/ROTATION

MAG (para 6) - DDA suggestions would make rotation too selective and too senior. Junior rotations would break down institutional barriers and rotation of substantive people would develop flexibility.

OP Comment: The MAG appears to have been selective in reading the references to rotational assignments. The full text of the references memorandum clearly identified three different kinds of rotations, each designed to meet different purposes and needs. The DDA's proposals stressed the need for a more programmed approach to rotations pointing out that while the number of rotations in FY 76 exceeded expectations, a relatively low number were for the purpose of employee development.

An additional suggestion (challenged by MAG) was the proposal to expand the number of senior staff officers involved in rotational assignments to enhance their perceptions of the inter-linkages within the Agency. Carefully planned and selective rotations of personnel between substantive jobs has also been encouraged where the qualifications of the rotated employees are pertinent to the assignment. For substantially rotational assignments to be meaningful - the incumbents must be capable of performing all major requirements of the position and the experience should enhance their skills, aptitudes and outlook in terms of their career field. Increased "flexibility" cannot be a goal in itself but rather a bi-product of developmental experiences. Rotations of employees to dissimilar duties is potentially counter-productive. It is damaging to the employee's career to be expected to carry out the functions of the new assignment without the benefit of the requisite experience or qualifications to perform.

MAG (para 7) - Quotas should be set, by Directorate, for professional people in rotational assignment. The use of direct swaps would help assure that competent people are offered for rotation. Suitability for rotation should be addressed in performance appraisal.

OP Comment: The appropriate number of rotational assignments in or out or within a Directorate (or sub-divisions) flows from serious and meaningful planning and should not be an arbitrary decision. When arbitrary "targets" are set it is almost inevitable that they will be met - whether the rotations are purposeful or not. Direct rotational "swaps" are administratively easier to implement but experience confirms that they are not often possible.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

We do not agree that potential for rotation should be a heavily weighted factor in personnel rating systems nor a subject to be addressed in performance evaluations. At best, the supervisor would be expressing an opinion on an issue that is not relative to an individual's current job performance. Many employees, because of their particular qualifications, skills and/or interests may never be candidates for rotation and no purpose is served in evaluating their suitability in this regard.

MAG (para 8) - A separate career service (or board) should be established for those on rotation. It should have power to promote and strong say concerning next assignment of rotatee.

OP Comment: A better understanding of the Agency's Career Service management system by MAG would have precluded their suggestion that a separate Rotatee Career Service Board - with oversight of rotatees and responsibility to promote - be established.

Centralized personnel management systems, such as exist in many other Government agencies, are of necessity uniformly structured, operate under rigid rules and procedures and do not possess the flexibilities deemed essential to meet the needs of our Agency. The MAG proposal conflicts with the basic premise that the component (Directorate or Career Service) is responsible and accountable for accomplishing its substantive mission and for the management of its assigned workforce.

MAG (para 9) - The assignments and promotions of all individuals who have reached GS-14 should be controlled by a single board, perhaps the one for rotatees.

OP Comment: This proposal reaching down to the GS-14 level would seriously conflict with the basic authority, responsibility and accountability of managers for management of their workforce and organizations in accomplishing their missions. There are more than 2,500 GS-14s and above in the Agency. Current planning includes formalization of centralized review of senior "key official" assignments by the EAG and possible subsequent inclusion of all supergrade assignments in the future. Experience with the "key official" reviews will provide a basis to determine the effectiveness of this approach.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIALSEPARATION

MAG (paras 12 and 13) - Low potential should be the single most important criterion for judging employees in their first several years on board. The probationary period is too short. Employees with longer service may have low potential yet contribute greatly to overall effectiveness.

OP Comment: The ADCI and the EAG have formally addressed the subject of "separation" with a decision to incorporate new elements in a more understandable new regulation. Publication of this regulation is currently held pending further consideration by the ADCI and the EAG on possible extension changes in the present one-year initial probationary period to a three-year period.

MAG (para 14) - A statement of competitive ranking should be included in each Fitness Report so that supervisors are forced to deal honestly with their subordinates. New rankings should be communicated immediately to the employee. Each employee should again be made aware of the right to see personnel files.

OP Comment: The Agency has for the most part good supervisors. They are conscientious. Fitness Reports today are far more particular and honest than five years ago. This is at least in part a result of constantly rotating membership of the evaluation panels. Regarding the remark on awareness of the employee to see his/her personnel file - it was open policy in 1974 [] reviewed their files), in 1975 [], in 1976, despite a radical change, because of a move to Ames Building, in the system of making each file available, []. Employees spend from 30 to 90 or more minutes in such a review and Agency policy requires another employee to be present. The suggestion that the Fitness Report incorporate the ranking of the employee in comparative evaluation is potentially harmful to the interests of employees. It would incorporate the ranking in the permanent record, where it might influence future assessments of performance through a halo or tarnish effect. The evaluation ranking is not appropriate to an appraisal of an employee's performance.

STAT

ENCOURAGING EXCELLENCE

MAG (paras 18 and 19) - CIA does not need to protect its specialists by reserving senior slots for them, which would deny promotion to someone more flexible and willing and able to assume

CONFIDENTIAL

supervisory responsibilities. With a poor market for specialists outside, the Agency can retain its specialists without incurring extraordinary costs.

OP Comment: A well qualified and effective analyst - like a well qualified manager - is worthy of compensation deserved. Over-emphasis on "flexibility" and "willingness" to assume supervisory functions must be avoided. The confirmed requirements of the functions of the position to be performed and the credentials and quality of performance by the incumbent are the key considerations in this area.

MAG (para 20) - There has been criticism of our unnecessary adherence to CSC rules and regulations. Why falsify titles and job descriptions to justify promotions? Why shouldn't a chief be allowed to decide which jobs are the most important and deserve the best grades?

OP Comment: The Office of Personnel's role, responsibilities, authorities, methodology, organizational structure and standards in carrying out the position management and classification program for the Agency has been completely reviewed and studied in-depth during the past year by an independent contractor and the Inspector General.

On 20 December 1976 the DDCI reaffirmed the principle that sound managerial practice required retention of authority and control for Agency position management and classification centrally with the Office of Personnel. Increasing external emphasis (Congressional and Presidential) on tighter controls on position classification decisions and concern for "grade creep" further dictate adherence to standards for adjudication of positions.

While the Agency adheres to the concepts and principles issued by the Civil Service Commission, we modify standards and adjudication criteria to meet the particular needs of the Agency. MAG's observation that supervisors and/or employees are falsifying job descriptions to justify promotions is a serious allegation of fraud. Whatever evidence they have to support this allegation should be made available for investigation and further action.

MAG (para 21) - We believe other changes are possible to facilitate rewarding excellence, especially at the lower levels. We believe that Agency policy of using the even grades for junior professionals has outlived its usefulness. At NPIC, a CIA GS-7 doing a solid job can expect to become a GS-8 in a year; his desk-mate, a DoD GS-7 doing the same solid job, can expect to become a GS-9 in a year. This is wrong.

CONFIDENTIAL

OP Comment: Approximately three years ago the Office of Personnel submitted a proposal to the Agency Management Committee recommending abolition of the "one-grade" progression. The decision at that time was to retain the existing system.

The NPIC situation is currently under study - including the differences in overtime policies of CIA and DoD.

MAG (para 24) - Capricious and arbitrary treatment with respect to the time-in-grade criterion leads 35 percent of our employees to judge the promotion system as unfair. We need it stated that time-in-grade is not a rigid requirement and that it is not sufficient grounds for promotion.

OP Comment: On the basis of unverified opinion and the questionable relationship of the possible adherence to time-in-grade guidelines by certain components, the MAG arrives at the firm conclusion that "this capricious and arbitrary treatment" leads 35% of our employees to consider the promotion system as unfair. The superficiality of such an oversimplified conclusion is self evident. The 35% negative statistic is taken from a question in the attitudinal survey, addressing not the promotion system but their perception of the fairness of promotions. Other pertinent statistics not mentioned by MAG are: 34% believe promotions are given fairly with 30% unsure. Sixty-five percent of respondents believe their pay is fair. According to last year's APP, 26% of Agency personnel were promoted during the year.

The results of the Attitudinal Survey must and will be subjected to full and complete analysis before final conclusions can be drawn and proposals for corrective action developed. The time-in-grade guideline has been treated anew in the new version of as approved by the EAG.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

MAG (para 25) - It should be made abundantly clear now that the EEO performance of each component will be reviewed in depth on a component-by-component basis at the end of the year and that the details of both superior and poor performance will be made public within the Agency.

OP Comment: The EAG has addressed the EEO problem. New policies and procedures have been installed and will be monitored as to effectiveness in this important area.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

MAG (para 26) - In many cases, employees with a complaint or grievance are unsure whether to go to the IG, the EEO Office, or both. As the DDA paper (p. 31) points out, employees do not understand grievance procedures. This is an area in which a Headquarters Bulletin or a letter to employees from the DDCI could do some good. What is needed is a clear, concise paper for all employees that explains in one document all the grievance mechanisms of the EEO office and the IG and explains where they work together and where they are independent.

OP Comment: This subject has already been addressed with a new regulation issued on grievance procedures. EEO procedures are clear. Grievance procedures are set forth in each Directorate's Handbook on Personnel Management. Perhaps employees do not absorb procedures until they have need to utilize them.

The Attitudinal Survey results indicate relatively high percentages of employees are not aware of many areas of information pertinent to their well-being but which is readily available in published handbooks, notices and employee bulletins.

MAG (para 27) - In the EEO area, even more than in others, we are handicapped by our lengthy personnel processing procedures. It is a fact of the 1970's that highly qualified minority applicants are in great demand. We should be making a particular point of looking for such individuals while they have at least a year left in college or graduate school. We should also have procedures for expediting processing of those who are clearly qualified and apparently clearable. There is no obvious reason why we cannot employ such individuals on unclassified projects pending final clearance and even keep them on for a year on such projects in the event that the unexpected clearance problem does crop up.

OP Comment: In the fall of 1976 a new system of Directorate and OP coordinators and special procedures was installed to expedite decision making and processing of minority applicants. Prior experiences with employment of uncleared personnel on unclassified projects have not been satisfactory. The individual who relocates here - with expectations high - and finally is found unclearable can suffer extreme hardship.

MAG (para 28) - We should also seek to expand our programs for hiring highly qualified minority applicants while they are still in school--or at the time of high school graduation--and assisting them in their college educations.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2005/07/26 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000200130006-4

OP Comment: This proposal is not legally possible.

MAG (para 30) - With respect to women, there are a number of problem areas to be worked on; assignment after pregnancy leave, assignment after return from overseas duty, higher average age in the better grades, less assignment of women to high visibility opportunities.

OP Comment: Inequities relative to women were set forth in the OP paper that MAG is commenting on. The percentages of promotion versus percentage of professional population are higher. Continued effort must be made to correct real inequities where they exist.

GENERAL

MAG (para 37) - An Office of Personnel subordinate to one Deputy Director cannot develop or implement personnel policy. We suggest a small organization (perhaps called the Office of Personnel Policy) reporting to the DDCI and responsible for: career service functions for rotatees and GS-14s and up, the same for detailees, developing or adjusting personnel policy and feedback, addressing questions of "mix," overseeing assignments to key positions, reviewing PRA practices, and troubleshooting career development, quality control, and application of policies and regulations.

OP Comment: The thrust of this proposal indicates a conviction that Agency personnel management will be enhanced by separating the Agency personnel policy function from personnel administration. By Federal regulation and on the basis of sound managerial concepts, the establishment of personnel policy is the responsibility of the Head of Agency. The Director of Personnel or other designated officials or advisory bodies (such as the former Management Committee and the current EAG) may advise such Head. The primary responsibility for personnel management operations or implementation rests with component managers who are responsible for the successful accomplishment of the Agency missions concerned.

In consideration of these concepts, this is the way it works in our Agency. The Office of Personnel, directly and internally involved in Agency-wide personnel functions (i.e., both personnel management and personnel administration) provides advice, proposals and staff support to the DCI, the DDCI and the Executive

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2005/07/26 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000200130006-4

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Advisory Group. The senior component managers, the primary officials directly involved in personnel management implementation both as major Agency organizational managers and Heads of Career Services, are members of the Executive Advisory Group. The present mechanisms relative to providing advice to the DCI and DDCI on personnel policy matters are comprised of those specific Agency officials with the best insights, experiences and expertise as a basis for their advice and recommendations.

The organizational location of the Office of Personnel within the Directorate of Administration has not inhibited the Director of Personnel in carrying out his independent responsibilities to the DCI and the DDCI relative to providing advice, the development of recommendations and the objective execution of such centralized functions as position classification and the evaluation and reporting of the effectiveness of personnel management implementation within the operating components of the Agency--including the Directorate of Administration. The capacity of the Director of Personnel to provide professional input on Agency personnel policy formulation is in fact enhanced by his collateral responsibilities for specific elements of Agency personnel management (such as consultation and advice on personnel policy matters, development and implementation of the Agency's personnel programs, position classification and the review and evaluation of personnel management implementation) and personnel administration (employee benefits and services programs, maintenance of manpower information systems, recruitment and placement, etc.).

In the period 1973-1974 when the then DCI established and defined new objectives to institute major new directions in Agency personnel management approaches, the Office of Personnel provided the staff support and input for the Management Committee in a collaborative effort leading to the institution of new and uniform Agency policies, common programmatic responsibilities and structured programs (APP and PDP) applicable to Agency career and personnel management. The changes instituted by the DCI in 1973-1974 were of such scope and substance that final evaluation of their efficacy and effectiveness cannot be fully determined at this early date. Some needed modifications and the desirability of increased emphasis on certain elements of the programmatic aspects of personnel management operations are already apparent and are currently under consideration by the EAG and the DDCI.

In summary, it would appear that the fragmentation of responsibility of the personnel policy advisory and/or oversight role to a new and separate entity in the Office of the DDCI

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

would fix responsibility with a staff element possessing neither the essential experiential base nor resources to provide the DCI and the DDCI with the quality of advice so essential to sound managerial decision. Such a staff would be divorced from the data base residing in the Office of Personnel, the insights of those officers providing personnel support, and the management of those personnel programs that execute personnel policies. In addition to these disadvantages, the establishment of yet another office would involve a net resource cost, without a full offset from foreseeable benefits. The Director of Personnel, in addition to his organizational relationship subordinate to the Deputy Director for Administration, has independent responsibilities to the DCI and DDCI on Agency-wide personnel policy and personnel management matters. This direct link is readily usable in lieu of establishing a separate office.

As neither the immediate proposal nor MAG have addressed the resources for this "small" new office, we have done some preliminary calculations. Based upon the DDO experience, we would expect that ten to thirty people would be required for the Career Management function. It is likely that another twenty-to thirty would be required for the intensive effort with respect to the policy formulation, evaluation and oversight functions. The staffing requirement could involve 30 to 60 people--a costly proposal with little evidence of any substantial realizable gains.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON SECONDARY POINTS

KEY OPERATING OFFICIALS

MAG (para 11) - The identification of the key positions is the first step in bringing the PDP to life.

OP Comment: The Acting DCI and the EAG have addressed the "Key Official" situation and a formal proposal for implementation, including ties to PDP, has been prepared and submitted to the ADCI by the Office of Personnel.

ENCOURAGING EXCELLENCE

MAG (para 16) - The psychological satisfaction of good employees will be enhanced if the promotion process is selective from the beginning, and if the propensity to promote everyone as long as there is space can be overcome. Promotions need to be more competitive all along the way.

OP Comment: Promotions are based on competitive evaluation. The bottlenecks at certain grade levels (they vary in some Directorates) is not necessarily evidence of non-selective promotion but is the product of combinations of factors that affect the relative speed of promotion. The proposed new regulation on promotion reinforces the principle of selectivity.

MAG (para 22) - We further believe that supervisors should be encouraged to award Quality Step Increases and that procedures for QSIs should be simplified. At present, despite the regulations, promotions are easier to grant than QSIs in practice, but the short-term solution of granting a promotion can mean the long-term drawback of having used up almost all the rewards and incentives we have to offer certain groups of people.

OP Comment: The criteria and purpose for the QSI are specifically quite different from the criteria for promotion. The granting of QSIs may appear to be administratively "easier to grant" but in fact the Career Service competitive evaluation deliberations relative to promotions are much more time consuming and demanding on the members of the Boards and Panels conducting the exercise.

MAG (para 23) - We also need some way to honor superior short-term performance--a purpose for which the QSI is sometimes misused. We do, of course, have certificates of merit. But we should also make much more extensive use of bonus programs, whereby a one-time lump sum payment is awarded for special achievements on a specific project or assignment.

CONFIDENTIAL

OP Comment: In 1974 the Management Committee, on the recommendation of OP, established the Special Achievement Award and the Exceptional Accomplishment Award. To date, 58 awards have been approved for a total of \$105,425. A recent award to an individual employee amounted to \$7000.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

MAG (para 29) - We should make every reasonable effort to enlist and retain minority employees whose abilities are patently superior. And we should be willing to take strong action in the case of managers now on board who are unwilling to carry out their responsibilities in this area.

OP Comment: Current policy, no disagreement.

NEW EODS

MAG (para 31) - Follow-up interviews of all EODs should be conducted at the end of the first year, but by the supervisors and board members, not by the Office of Personnel.

OP Comment: Supervisors certainly have an inherent roll in employee orientation and follow-up but Office of Personnel follow-up interviews provide the opportunity for individuals to more freely express their views, problems, etc.

MAG (para 32) - New EODs should be told early and often about job opportunities throughout the Agency and should be encouraged to begin planning a future.

OP Comment: New EODs of necessity must concentrate on the job at hand and increase their capacity and skills to perform the duties of their current assignment. The Developmental Profiles and counseling services available within their career service and sub-groups are designed to provide projections for the future.

MAG (para 33) - We believe that rating supervisors on how well they provide on-the-job training and orientation (p. 29) is worthwhile, though we recognize that it will be a sterile exercise in many cases.

OP Comment: The rating of supervisors on how well they provide on-the-job training and orientation in our view will be constructive. We do not share MAG's pessimism that it will be a sterile exercise.

CONFIDENTIAL

MAG (para 35) - We do not need a lot of elaborate new systems. We need to use those we have or discard them. This applies not only to PDP and ADP--it applies to LOI's, MBO, the lower 3 percent or 5 percent exercises, fitness reports, etc. As human beings, we all have difficulty being honest with one another, particularly where honesty requires examining weaknesses as well as strengths. We must, nevertheless, force ourselves to do it.

OP Comment: We agree.

MAG (para 36) - We think new and different approaches to personnel assessment should be tried. This would include both peer rating and rating of supervisors.

OP Comment: Consideration is currently underway to study current performance and competitive evaluation systems to determine their effectiveness in meeting informational needs. On the basis of data developed in this effort other approaches will be explored as appropriate.